Sequences of projective measurements in generalized probabilistic models

Matthias Kleinmann
Naturwissenschaftlich-Technische Fakultät, Universität Siegen, Walter-Flex-Straße 3, 57068 Siegen, Germany and
Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Caixa Postal 702, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais 31270-901, Brazil

We define a simple rule that allows to describe sequences of projective measurements for a broad class of generalized probabilistic models. This class embraces quantum mechanics and classical probability theory, but, for example, also the hypothetical Popescu-Rohrlich box. For quantum mechanics, the definition yields the established Lüders's rule, which is the standard rule how to update the quantum state after a measurement. In the general case it can be seen as the least disturbing or most coherent way to perform sequential measurements. As example we show that Spekkens's toy model[1] is an instance of our definition. We also demonstrate the possibility of strong post-quantum correlations as well as the existence of triple-slit correlations for certain non-quantum toy models.

arXiv:1402.3583v2 [quant-ph] 10 Sep 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a fundamental property of quantum mechanics that any nontrivial measurement disturbs the system it acts on. This disturbance is responsible for very particular phenomena like the quantum Zeno effect[2,3], where the time-evolution of a system is frozen due to repeated measurements, or the contextual behavior of a quantum system[4], where measurement outcomes depend on the choice of previous compatible measurements. Compared to the classical world, where a measurement—at least in principle—may leave the system unchanged, this quantum property seems to be very particular and at the same time very fundamental.

The most common formulation of the this disturbance is due to Lüders[5,6] and determines how the state of a system changes after a measurement: $\rho \mapsto \Pi\rho\Pi/\operatorname{tr}(\rho\Pi)$. But this is only one out of many possible state changes that may occur in an experiment. In the most general case the post-measurement state can be seen as the result of a coherent evolution involving an auxiliary system and a destructive measurement on that auxiliary system. This fundamental result by Ozawa[7,8] does, however, not explain the special role of Lüders's rule. Conversely, Ozawa's result gives a very particular model of a measurement and one might argue that giving up Lüders's rule as a fundamental entity might actually make too strong assumptions on the peculiarities of the measurement process in quantum mechanics.

In this work we provide a very small set of assumptions that uniquely singles out Lüders's rule within quantum mechanics on the one hand, and on the other hand has many desirable properties when applied to hypothetical non-quantum models. These two aspects have been discussed for a long time[9–12], and some consensus seems to exist that the mathematical concept of a filter is an appropriate approach. We advertise that the axioms that we suggest here are significantly simpler then those that have appeared before while at the same time they imply more favorable physical properties.

We proceed as follows. The introduction is completed by a detailed reminder on how post-measurement states are treated in quantum mechanics, cf. Sec. I A, and a summary of the mathematical framework of ordered vector spaces in Sec. I B, enriched with examples in Sec. I C. In Sec. II we introduce the notion of projective, neutral, and coherent f-compatible maps, the latter of which we propose as a generalized definition of Lüders's rule. We investigate fundamental properties of this definition and give examples, in particular we study the case of quantum mechanics in Sec. III A, a large class of toy models in Sec. III B, and the n-slit experiment in Sec. III C. We conclude with a discussion of our findings in Sec. IV.

A. Quantum instruments

Before we start to formulate the behavior of measurement sequences in generalized probabilistic models, let us first recall the established formalism in quantum mechanics[8].

We consider a situation where first an observable A and then an observable B is measured. (In order to simplify the discussion, we assume that A and B have pure point spectrum.) The system subject to the measurements is initially described by a density operator ρ and the measurement of A is assumed to have yielded the result a. With the spectral decomposition as $A = \sum_a a\Pi_a$, according to Lüders[5,6], the expected value of B is given by

$$\langle B|A = a\rangle_\rho = \mathrm{tr}[\Pi_a\rho\Pi_a B]/\,\mathrm{tr}(\rho\Pi_a) = \mathrm{tr}[\rho\phi_a(B)]/\,\mathrm{tr}[\rho\phi_a(\mathbb{1})]. \tag{1}$$

For the second equality we introduced the map $\phi_a\colon X \mapsto \Pi_a X \Pi_a$, so that it becomes manifest that the conditioned expectation value on the l.h.s. arises directly from the laws of conditional probabilities and the quantum instrument $\mathcal{I}_\mathrm{L}\colon a \mapsto \phi_a$. (In literature, the notion of a Lüders instrument has been established, but it covers a broader set of instruments then those that follow Lüders's rule.)

The situation described in Eq. (1) can be further formalized. With the spectral decomposition $B = \sum b\mathrm{P}_b$, the probability to get firstly the outcome a and then the outcome b is

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega(\Pi_a \triangleright \mathrm{P}_b) = \omega[\phi_a(\mathrm{P}_b)], \tag{2}$$

where $\omega\colon X \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(\rho X)$ is a way to write the quantum state and $\Pi_a \triangleright \mathrm{P}_b$ is the event "Π_a then P_b."

Depending on the experimental implementation, the actual instrument $\mathcal{I}'$ will deviate from the instrument that has been described by Lüders. But there is confidence that $\mathcal{I}_\mathrm{L}$ can be approximated to an arbitrary precision, since on a formal level[7] one can implement $\mathcal{I}_\mathrm{L}$ by virtue of an ancilla system in a pure state, an entangling unitary between the probe and ancilla system, and a destructive measurement solely on the ancilla system. This shows that $\mathcal{I}_\mathrm{L}$ can be implemented as an immediate consequence of

(i) independent pure state preparation $\rho \mapsto \rho \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$,

(ii) unitary evolution,

(iii) Born's rule, $\mathbb{P}_\omega(A = a) = \omega(\Pi_a)$.

However, any instrument can be implemented with the ingredients (i)–(iii). The question that drives our subsequent analysis is which of the properties of the instrument $\mathcal{I}_\mathrm{L}$ corresponding to Lüders's rule are most characteristic. Within the framework of quantum mechanics there would be a variety of possible characteristics that single out Lüders's rule

and without comparing to other possibilities, it would be difficult to argue in favor of one or another. Our approach is to broaden the mathematical concepts, so that not only quantum mechanics can be described but also a wider set of generalized probabilistic models is covered.

B. Positivity and generalized probabilistic models

Quantum events as well as classical events can be mathematical described by ordered vector spaces. This is based on the observation that the main characteristics of either theory is dominated by the notion of positivity. In particular in quantum mechanics, the (mixed) states are given by maps $\omega\colon X \mapsto \mathrm{tr}(\rho X)$ which obey $\omega(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and $\omega(F) \geq 0$ for all positive semi-definite operators F. Conversely, a generalized measurement in quantum mechanics is a family of positive semi-definite operators (F_a) with $\sum_a F_a = \mathbb{1}$. The operators F_a are then called effects. This positivity structure is largely motivated from the probabilistic interpretation $\mathbb{P}_\omega(F_a) = \omega(F_a)$. The class of models which follows a similar interpretation is captured by the mathematical concept of an ordered vectors space. In turn, the set of models that can be fitted into this mathematical concept contains instances that are in conflict with the predictions of quantum mechanics[13,14]. For this reason, these models are called generalized probabilistic models.

We now discuss the mathematical concepts related to ordered vectors spaces while in Sec. I C we present explicit examples. For a more verbose introduction into the mathematical concepts we particularly recommend the introduction of Ref. 15 and the books by Alfsen [16] and Paulsen [17]. A real order unit vector space is a triple (V, V^+, e), such that

(i) V is a real vector space (not necessarily finite-dimensional).

(ii) $V^+ \subset V$ is a cone, i.e., $V^+ + V^+ = V^+ = \mathbb{R}^+ V^+$ and $V^+ \cap -V^+ = \{\, 0 \,\}$.

(iii) $e \in V^+$ is an order unit, i.e., for any $x \in V$ there is an $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $re + x \in V^+$.

We wrote $\mathbb{R}^+$ for the set of non-negative reals. It follows[15] that $V^+ - V^+ = V$. For two elements $x, y \in V$ the condition $x - y \in V^+$ defines a partial order and one writes $x \geq y$.

The order unit e is Archimedean provided that for any $x \in V$ the property $x + \mathbb{R}^+ e \subset V^+ \cup \{\, x \,\}$ implies $x \in V^+$. This property in some sense requires that V^+ is "closed." While we use this property merely for technical reasons, also note, that an order unit vector space can always be modified in such a way that it has an Archimedean order unit. This Archimedeanization[15] works by constructing the "closure" of the cone and identifying operationally indistinguishable elements. These operations are physically benign and hence we only consider Archimedean order unit vector (AOU) spaces.

We continue to fix notation. Within the dual space $V^* = \{\, \alpha\colon V \to \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha \text{ is linear} \,\}$ the set

$$\mathcal{S}(V, V^+, e) = \left\{\, \omega \in V^* \;\middle|\; \omega(e) = 1 \text{ and } \omega(V^+) \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \,\right\} \tag{3}$$

is the convex set of states and the definition

$$\|x\| = \inf \left\{\, r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \;\middle|\; -re \leq x \leq re \,\right\} \tag{4}$$

provides the order norm of $x \in V$. It is convenient to define the set of effects, i.e., the convex set of positive elements bounded by e,

$$V_e^+ = V^+ \cap (e - V^+), \tag{5}$$

and to write for the normalized representatives of the extremal rays of V^+ the symbol

$$\partial^+ V^+ = \left\{ f \in V^+ \;\middle|\; \|f\| = 1 \text{ and } (0 \leq g \leq f \text{ implies } g \in \mathbb{R}^+ f) \right\} \tag{6}$$

We occasionally construct V^+ from a finite set $\mathcal{A} \subset V$ of extremal rays via

$$\operatorname{cone} \mathcal{A} = \left\{ x \in V \;\middle|\; x = \textstyle\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} r_a \, a, \text{ where all } r_a \in \mathbb{R}^+ \right\}. \tag{7}$$

For two AOU spaces (V, V^+, e) and (W, W^+, e'), a linear map $\phi\colon V \to W$ is positive, provided that it maps positive elements to positive elements, $\phi(V^+) \subset W^+$. (When we let ϕ be a map, we always imply that ϕ is linear.) If $\phi(e) = e'$ then ϕ is unital. The spaces are order isomorphic, if there exists a positive unital bijection $\psi\colon V \to W$ such that its inverse is also positive.

Proposition 1. We recall three results from Ref. 15.

(i) $f \in V^+$ if and only if $\omega(f) \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$.

(ii) If $f \in V^+$, then there exists a state $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$, such that $\omega(f) = \|f\|$.

(iii) For $x \in V$ we have $-\|x\| e \leq x \leq \|x\| e$.

In principle one is free to choose the AOU space (V, V^+, e) or the states $\mathcal{S} \subset U$ with some embedding vector space U as fundamental object. If $\mathcal{S}$ is fundamental, then[10] we can define V to be the space of affine functions on U, let $V^+ = \{ \xi \in V \mid \xi(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \}$, and choose e with $e(\mathcal{S}) = \{ 1 \}$. Since we do not want to make any particular point out of which space is fundamental, we may assume that V is reflexive, $V = V^{**}$. By virtue of Proposition 1 (i) this would imply that (V, V^+, e) and $[V^{**}, (V^{**})^+, e^{**}]$ are order isomorphic.

C. Examples of ordered vectors spaces

The reason why AOU spaces are considered to be a good framework to describe generalized probabilistic models is that classical events and quantum events can be described by means of AOU spaces[18,19]. For a recent introduction into the physical interpretation we refer to Ref. 20.

Classical events. A set of discrete classical events—e.g. the outcomes when rolling a dice—defines a so-called AOU lattice. It is the n-fold Cartesian product of $(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+, 1)$, where n is the number of outcomes. The set of states is given by the maps $\mathbf{v} \mapsto \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ with $\mathbf{p}_k \geq 0$ for all k, and $\sum_k \mathbf{p}_k = 1$. The order norm reads $\|\mathbf{v}\| = \max_k |\mathbf{v}_k|$, turning V into the Banach space ℓ_n^∞.

Quantum events. For quantum mechanics, we choose the bounded self-adjoint operators as vector space V and we identify V^+ to be the set of positive semi-definite operators. With the choice $e = \mathbb{1}$ this forms an AOU space, cf. Theorem 1.95 in Ref. 21. The set of quantum effects is V_e^+. The quantum states can be represented by the maps $X \mapsto \operatorname{tr}(\rho X)$ where ρ is positive semi-definite with $\operatorname{tr} \rho = 1$. (For infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, however, not all functionals in $\mathcal{S}$ can be written this way.) The order norm $\|X\|$ yields the operator norm of X and the extremal set $\partial^+ V^+$ is exactly the set of rank-one projections.

Dichotomic norm cones. A simple class of examples is constructed as $V = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $V^+ = \{ (t, \mathbf{x}) \mid t \geq \|\mathbf{x}\| \}$, and $e = (1, \mathbf{0})$, where $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ is a norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Such cones only allow

dichotomic observables in the sense that $e - \partial^+V^+ = \partial^+V^+$. However several interesting cases are instances of this example: the event space of tossing a coin (classical bit, $d = 1$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = |\mathbf{x}_1|$), the local part of a Popescu-Rohrlich box[13] (generalized bit[22], $d = 2$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = |\mathbf{x}_1| + |\mathbf{x}_2|$), the quantum mechanical two-level system (quantum bit, $d = 3$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sqrt{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}}$), and "hyperbits"[23] which generalize the quantum bit by allowing for $d > 3$ while keeping the Euclidean norm. The states for a dichotomic norm cone are the maps $(t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto t + \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ with $\|\mathbf{w}\|_* \leq 1$, where $\|\mathbf{w}\|_* \equiv \sup\{\, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{y} \mid \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq 1 \,\}$ is the dual norm. The order norm is also easy to evaluate, $\|(t, \mathbf{x})\| = |t| + \|\mathbf{x}\|$.

A pathological example. We define $V^+ = \operatorname{cone}\{\, a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_6 \,\}$ where $a_1, \ldots, a_4$ is a basis of V, $a_5 = a_1 - a_3 + a_4$, and $a_6 = a_2 + a_3 - a_4$. The order unit is chosen to be $e = a_1 + a_2 + \frac{1}{2}(a_3 + a_4)$. This case is pathological in the sense that there is no way to write $e = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{A}} v$ for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \{\, a_1, \ldots, a_6 \,\} = \partial^+V^+$.

II. SEQUENTIAL MEASUREMENTS

We now discuss sequential measurements for such generalized probabilistic models for which the measurement effects can be squeezed into an AOU space (V, V^+, e). That is, any measurement can be described by a family of effects $(f_k) \subset V_e^+$ with $\sum_k f_k = e$—this is in analogy to the generalized measurements that occur in quantum mechanics. Following the discussion in Sec. I A, we consider the situation that a sequence of two measurements has been performed and the consecutive outcomes $f, g \in V_e^+$ have occurred. What is the prediction for the probability $\mathbb{P}_\omega(f \triangleright g)$ for the event $f \triangleright g$, given that the system was in a state $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$?

This probability will clearly depend on the actual implementation of the first measurement and this implementation is readily summarized by a map $\phi\colon V \to V$, so that $\mathbb{P}_\omega(f \triangleright g) = \omega[\phi(g)]$. This implies that ϕ is positive and for consistency we assume $\phi(e) = f$, i.e., the all-embracing outcome e occurs with unit probability, given that previously the outcome f has occurred. We also assumed that ϕ is linear, so that performing with probability p a measurement with outcome g and with probability $1 - p$ a measurement with outcome h obeys $\mathbb{P}[f \triangleright pg + (1-p)h)] = p\mathbb{P}(f \triangleright g) + (1-p)\mathbb{P}(f \triangleright h)$. A positive map ϕ with $\phi(e) = f$ is called f-compatible[8].

In principle, any choice of an f-compatible map[1] may be suitable to describe $f \triangleright g$. Here we are concerned about the projective measurements which generalize Lüders's rule. The following notions capture important properties of Lüders's rule.

Definition 2. Let ϕ be an f-compatible map for $f \in V_e^+$, i.e., $\phi(e) = f$ and $\phi(V^+) \subset V^+$.

(i) ϕ is projective, if $\phi \circ \phi = \phi$.

(ii) ϕ is neutral, if $\omega \circ \phi = \omega$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\omega(f) = 1$.

(iii) ϕ is coherent, if $\phi(g) = g$ for any $g \in V^+$ with $g \leq f$.

One might be tempted to use f-compatible projections for defining a generalization of Lüders's rule. For an extremal element, $f \in \partial^+V^+$, such a map is of the form $\phi = f\omega$, where $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$ is a state with $\omega(f) = 1$ [the existence of such a state is due to Proposition 1 (ii)].

[1] In quantum mechanics we would be restricted to completely positive maps, but this subtlety can be ignored for the discussion here.

In quantum mechanics this already yields uniquely Lüders's rule for rank-one projections. Furthermore, any family $(f_k) \subset V_e^+$ with $\sum f_k \leq e$ and f_k-compatible projections ϕ_k enjoys perfect repeatability, $\phi_k \circ \phi_\ell = \delta_{k,\ell}\phi_k$, utilizing the Kronecker symbol $\delta_{k,\ell}$. This holds, since for $k \neq \ell$ and any $h \in V_e^+$ we have $0 \leq \phi_k\phi_\ell h \leq \phi_k\phi_\ell e = \phi_k f_\ell = -\phi_k(e - f_k - f_\ell) \leq 0$.

Unfortunately, projectivity does not sufficiently fix the choices for ϕ. For example, $\phi = e\omega$ is an e-compatible projection, but any subsequent measurement will solely depend on the arbitrary choice of $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$. Previously[9–12], filters have been considered as a possible extensions of Lüders's rule to generalized probabilistic models. A filter is a neutral f-compatible projection, but it is only called a filter if there also exists a neutral f-compatible projection for $e - f$. Here, we study a different extension of Lüders's rule, namely the coherent Lüders's rules.

Definition 3. A coherent Lüders's rule (CLR) for $f \in V_e^+$ is a coherent f-compatible map.

We occasionally write $f^\sharp$ for a CLR of f, although this map is not necessarily uniquely defined by the above condition.

A possible interpretation behind the definition of coherence is that the relation $g \leq f$ indicates that the outcome g provides always a finer information than f in the sense that independent of the state ω of the system, g is always less likely to be triggered than f. Thus getting firstly the course grained information f and then the fine grained information g is assumed not to influence g. Hence f preserves all the "coherences" of g. We also refer to Proposition 5, Proposition 6, the example of a triple-slit experiment in Sec. III C, and the Discussion in Sec. IV for further reasoning in favor of this definition. In Sec. II C it is also shown that neutral f-compatible projections and coherent f-compatible maps are different concepts.

A. Basic properties of coherent Lüders's rules

There are several equivalent ways of expressing Definition 3.

Lemma 4. For a positive map ϕ and an effect $f \in V_e^+$, the following statements are equivalent.

(i) $\phi(e) = f$ and $\phi(g) = g$ for all $0 \leq g \leq f$.
(ii) $\phi(e) \leq f$ and $\phi(g) \geq g$ for all $0 \leq g \leq f$.
(iii) $a \leq \phi(g) \leq f\|g\|$ for all $g \in V^+$, whenever $0 \leq a \leq f$ and $a \leq g$.
(iv) $a \leq \phi(g) \leq f$ for all $g \in V_e^+$, whenever $0 \leq a \leq f$ and $a \leq g$.

Proof. In order to see that (i) implies (iii), note that $\phi(g) = \phi(g-a) + a \geq a$. Furthermore, $f\|g\| - \phi(g) \geq 0$ follows immediately when considering $\phi(\|g\|e - g) \geq 0$ and by fact that $\|g\|e \geq g$ holds since e is Archimedean.

Obviously (iii) implies (iv), since for $g \in V_e^+$ we have $\|g\| \leq 1$.

Statement (ii) follows from (iv) by letting $g_{(\mathrm{iv})} = e$ (yielding $\phi(e) \leq f$) and by choosing $g_{(\mathrm{iv})} = g_{(\mathrm{ii})} = a$ (yielding $\phi(g_{(\mathrm{ii})}) \geq g_{(\mathrm{ii})}$).

We finally show that (i) follows from (ii). We first use that $\phi(e - f) \geq 0$ and thus $f \geq \phi(e) \geq \phi(f) \geq f$, i.e., $\phi(e) = f = \phi(f)$. Then $\phi(g) - g \leq \phi(f) - f \equiv 0$, where the inequality follows from $f - g \leq \phi(f - g)$, which is due to $0 \leq f - g \leq f$. But $\phi(g) \leq g$ can only be compatible with $\phi(g) \geq g$ when $\phi(g) = g$. □

Note, that with statement (iv) of this lemma, we have $\phi(h) = f$ for $f \leq h \leq e$, by letting $a = f$ and $g = h$.

From a physical perspective, a CLR for f describes exactly such a measurement that does not disturb any other subsequent measurement with outcome f.

Proposition 5. Let $\mathcal{C} \supset (V^+ \otimes \mathcal{S})$ be some cone of positive maps and let ϕ be an f-compatible map for $f \in V_e^+$. Then ϕ is coherent if and only if $\phi \circ \psi = \psi$ holds for all f-compatible maps $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. If ψ is f-compatible, then $\psi(h) \leq \psi(e) = f$ for any $h \in V_e^+$. It follows that $\phi \circ \psi = \psi$ if ϕ is a CLR. For the converse we consider $\psi = (f-g)\omega + g\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$ with $0 \leq g \leq f$ and $\omega, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. This map is clearly f-compatible and we define $\Delta \equiv \phi \circ \psi - \psi = [\phi(f) - f]\omega + [\phi(g) - g](\sigma - \omega)$. From $\Delta(e) = 0$ we obtain $\phi(f) = f$ and assuming $\sigma \neq \omega$, also $\phi(g) = g$ must hold. Hence ϕ is coherent. □

A CLR in particular obeys repeatability and compatibility.

Proposition 6. Let $f^\sharp$ and $g^\sharp$ be two CLRs for $f, g \in V_e^+$, respectively. We have:

(i) $f^\sharp$ is projective.

(ii) If $g \leq f$ then $f^\sharp g = g^\sharp f$.

(iii) If $g \leq f$ and $g^\sharp$ is unique for g, then $f^\sharp g^\sharp = g^\sharp f^\sharp$.

Proof. We implicitly use Lemma 4 (iv). Then $f^\sharp h \leq f$ for any $h \in V_e^+$ and hence $f^\sharp(f^\sharp h) = f^\sharp h$. If $g \leq f$ then immediately $f^\sharp g = g = g^\sharp f$ (cf. also the remark after Lemma 4). If the CLR for g is unique then $f^\sharp g^\sharp = g^\sharp f^\sharp$, since $f^\sharp g^\sharp = g^\sharp$ and on the other hand $g^\sharp f^\sharp$ is a valid CLR for g. □

We mention that the property of being neutral or coherent is robust under sections. A section[24] is a positive unital injection τ from (W, W^+, e') to (V, V^+, e), such that there exists a positive surjection $\tau' \colon V \to W$ with $\tau' \circ \tau = \mathrm{id}_W$. If ϕ is a neutral/coherent $\tau(f)$-compatible map, then $\tau' \circ \phi \circ \tau$ is a neutral/coherent f-compatible map. An important instance of this observation is the embedding of the classical events into quantum events via $\tau \colon \mathbf{v} \mapsto \mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{v})$. In contrast, general $\tau(f)$-compatible projections do not always induce f-compatible projections.

B. Conditions on elements with a coherent Lüders's rule

Not all $f \in V_e^+$ admit a CLR as we see next. But the CLR for e is the identity mapping, while for 0 it is the zero mapping. On the other hand, if f is extremal, $f \in \partial^+ V^+$, then any f-compatible projection is a CLR. For the general situation we have

Proposition 7. For $f \in V_e^+$ consider the following statements.

(i) f admits a CLR.

(ii) $g \leq f\|g\|$ for all $0 \leq g \leq f$.

(iii) $0 \leq g \leq f$ and $g \leq e - f$ only for $g = 0$.

Then (i) implies (ii) and (ii) implies (iii).

Proof. Statement (ii) is a direct consequence of Lemma 4 (iii), $g = f^\sharp g \leq f\|g\|$. For the second part we consider $0 \leq g \leq f \leq e - g$. Then $0 \leq g \leq f\|g\| \leq \|g\|(e-g)$ and therefore $e\|g\|/(\|g\|+1) \geq g$, which contradicts $\|g\| \equiv \inf\{\, r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \mid re \geq g \,\}$ unless $\|g\| = 0$. By the Archimedean property the assertion follows. □

From part (ii) of this proposition it immediately follows that if $f = \sum_k p_k f_k$ with $(f_k) \subset \partial^+ V^+$ and real numbers $p_k > 0$ then already $f_k \leq f$. But one cannot conclude that there exists a decomposition of f into extremal elements with unit weights, cf. the pathological example form Sec. I C with $f = e$. This pathological space also provides an example where (iii) does not imply (ii). The counterexample works with $f = e - a_1 - a_2 \equiv (a_3 + a_4)/2$, which obeys (iii). But $f - pa_3 \geq 0$ only for $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ in contradiction to (ii). At the moment it remains unclear whether (ii) implies (i), even though it does not seem plausible to hold. On the other hand, for quantum mechanics, already statement (iii) can only hold if F is a projection since $0 \leq \sqrt{F}(\mathbb{1} - F)\sqrt{F} \equiv F - F^2 \leq F$ and $0 \leq (\mathbb{1} - F)^2 \equiv \mathbb{1} - 2F + F^2$, i.e., $F - F^2 \leq \mathbb{1} - F$. By assumption we then have $F - F^2 = 0$ and hence F is a projection.

C. Neutral maps

Neutral f-compatible projections have been suggested previously[9–12] as an extension of Lüders's rule to generalized probabilistic models. For the moment we call them neutral Lüders's rules (NLRs). If f and $e - f$ allow an NLR, then an NLR for f is a filter. We observe:

1. Some elements do not have an NLR, despite being extremal. Consider the dichotomic norm cone (cf. Sec. I C) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sum |\mathbf{x}_i|$ and $d \geq 2$. In this case, there exists no neutral map ϕ for any of the extremal elements $f \in \partial^+ V^+$ since states with $\omega(f) = 1$ are not unique but on the other hand $\phi = f\omega$ must hold for ϕ to be an f-compatible projection.

2. Some elements with an NLR do not have a CLR. An example occurs in the pathological example from Sec. I C for the effect $f = e - a_1 - a_2$. As demonstrated at the end of Sec. II B this element does not have a CLR. But the only state with $\omega(f) = 1$ is $\omega(a_k) = (0,0,1,1,0,0)_k$ and hence $f\omega$ is an NLR for f. One can also construct an NLR for the complement $f_\neg = e - f$, showing that $f\omega$ is a filter. The NLR for $f_\neg$ is not unique, but a possible representative is given by $a_1\omega_1 + a_2\omega_2$ with $\omega_i(a_k) = \delta_{i,k} + \delta_{i+4,k}$.

III. APPLICATIONS

A. Quantum mechanics

In quantum mechanics, $F \in V_e^+$ admits a CLR if and only if it is a projection. We have shown necessity in Sec. II B and in order to show sufficiency we assume that F is a projection and that $F^\sharp(X) = FXF$. It remains to show that $G = FGF$ for any $0 \leq G \leq F$. Although this is an easy and well-known relation, we shall spend a few lines to show it: We write $F_\neg = \mathbb{1} - F$. Then $0 \leq F_\neg(F - G)F_\neg = -F_\neg G F_\neg \leq 0$ and thus $F_\neg G = F_\neg G F$. But $0 \leq (F + \lambda F_\neg)G(F + \lambda F_\neg) = FGF + \lambda(F_\neg GF + FGF_\neg)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $F_\neg GF = -FGF_\neg$, i.e., $G = FGF$.

The rule $F^\sharp\colon X \mapsto FXF$ is unique as we demonstrate by construction. Assume $G \in V_e^+$. Then $0 \leq F(\mathbb{1} - G)F = F - FGF$ implying $F^\sharp(FGF) = FGF$ and $0 \leq F^\sharp[F_\neg(\mathbb{1} - G)F_\neg] =$

$-F^\sharp(F_\neg G F_\neg)$ which yields $F^\sharp(F_\neg G F_\neg) = 0$. With $G'_\lambda \equiv (F + \lambda F_\neg) G (F + \lambda F_\neg) \geq 0$ we have

$$F^\sharp(G'_\lambda) = FGF + \lambda A \geq 0, \text{ where } A = F^\sharp(F_\neg G F + F G F_\neg), \tag{8}$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies again $A = 0$ and hence $F^\sharp(G) \equiv F^\sharp(G'_1) = FGF$.

We mention that we did not assume that $F^\sharp$ is completely positive but nevertheless obtained the intended quantum mechanical Lüders's rule.

B. Dichotomic norm cones

As a second example, we consider the dichotomic norm cones of Sec. I C. For this AOU spaces the set of effects admitting a CLR is given by $\{\, 0, e \,\} \cup \partial^+ V^+$, cf. Appendix A. This shows that dichotomic norm cones form a very convenient toy model for which basically the assumption of an f-compatible projection alone leads to a reasonable Lüders's rule. Put into an explicit form, any extremal element $f \in \partial^+ V^+$ is of the form $f = (\frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{f})$ with $\|\mathbf{f}\| = \frac{1}{2}$ and any corresponding CLR reads thus

$$f^\sharp \colon (t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto (t + \mathbf{f}' \cdot \mathbf{x}) f, \text{ with } \mathbf{f}' \cdot \mathbf{f} = \tfrac{1}{2}, \text{ and } \|\mathbf{f}'\|_* = 1. \tag{9}$$

Since the set of CLRs for a given effect f is convex, it follows that if $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ is a p-norm with $1 < p < \infty$ then the CLR is unique. This is due to the fact that then the dual norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_*$ is the $[p/(p-1)]$-norm, the unit-sphere of which only has convex subsets with a single vector. On the other hand, for the Manhattan Norm, $p = 1$, and e.g. $\mathbf{f} = (\frac{1}{2}, 0, \ldots, 0)$ the available choices are any of $\mathbf{f}' = (1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_d)$ with arbitrary coefficients $-1 \leq \xi_k \leq 1$.

As an example we compute the effective "observable" for an sequential measurement of two dichotomic observables $A = a - a_\neg$ and $B = b - b_\neg$ with $a_\neg = e - a$ and $b_\neg = e - b$. That is, with the notation $A\sharp = a^\sharp - a^\sharp_\neg$, we aim at $A\sharp B$. For simplicity we assume that in $a^\sharp$ and $a^\sharp_\neg$ we have $\mathbf{a}'_\neg = -\mathbf{a}'$, which surely holds when both CLRs are unique. Writing $b = (\beta, \mathbf{b})$ yields

$$A\sharp B = (2\beta - 1)A + 2(\mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{b}) e. \tag{10}$$

If $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$, e.g., because b is extremal, then the expected value $\langle A\sharp B \rangle_\omega \equiv \omega(A\sharp B)$ does not depend on the prepared state ω. For the case of the Euclidean norm, $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sqrt{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}}$, and $B\sharp$ defined analogously to $A\sharp$, we find in addition $A\sharp B = B\sharp A$. Both aspects have been observed already for qubits[25] which corresponds to the dichotomic norm cone with $d = 3$ and the Euclidean norm.

Dichotomic norm cones can have strong non-quantum behavior. As an example we consider the simplest correlation term $\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle$,

$$\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle_\omega = \omega(A\sharp B + B - A). \tag{11}$$

For so-called macro-realistic systems (which are in our language CLR measurements on the classical events) the constraint $\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle \leq 1$ is valid[26], while for quantum mechanics the bound $\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle \leq \frac{3}{2}$ is in order[27]. Note, that the quantum mechanical bound only holds for CLRs[28]. For dichotomic norm cones and assuming again that always $\mathbf{a}' = -\mathbf{a}'_\neg$ we obtain the sharp bound (cf. Appendix B)

$$\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle \leq 2\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}\| + 2\mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{b}, \text{ where } \|\mathbf{b}\| = \tfrac{1}{2}. \tag{12}$$

In the case of the Manhattan norm, $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sum |\mathbf{x}_k|$, and $d = 2$ we find that the r.h.s. of this inequality can easily reach 3 by choosing $\mathbf{a} = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$, $\mathbf{b} = (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $\mathbf{a}' = (1, 1)$.

We finally mention that Spekkens's toy model[1] implements a CLR. In this model, there are six extremal elements $\partial^+ V^+ = \{\, a_{\pm 1}, a_{\pm 2}, a_{\pm 3} \,\}$ given by $a_i = (\frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{a}_{(i)})$, with

$$\mathbf{a}_{(\pm 1)} = (\pm\tfrac{1}{2}, 0, 0),\ \mathbf{a}_{(\pm 2)} = (0, \pm\tfrac{1}{2}, 0),\ \text{and}\ \mathbf{a}_{(\pm 3)} = (0, 0, \pm\tfrac{1}{2}). \tag{13}$$

These elements form observables $A_k = a_{+k} - a_{-k}$ and hence $e = a_{+k} + a_{-k} \equiv (1, \mathbf{0})$. This way Spekkens's toy model is the dichotomic norm cone with $d = 3$ and the Manhattan norm. Spekkens also introduced a state update rule for this model, which is such that

$$\mathbb{P}(a_i \triangleright a_j) = \mathbb{P}(a_i) \begin{cases} 1 & i = j, \\ 0 & i = -j, \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

This update rule corresponds to the CLR defined in Eq. (9) with the choice $\mathbf{a}'_{(i)} = 2\mathbf{a}_{(i)}$.

C. The triple-slit experiment

While the double-slit experiment is a prime example of a quantum effect, within quantum mechanics there are no higher order interference terms, as has been found by Sorkin[29]. This absence was also verified in experiments[30]. Recently, the triple-slit experiment has been investigated as instance of sequential measurements in the context of generalized probabilistic models[12] and the (im)possibility of triple-slit correlations in such models was discussed e.g. in Refs. 31 and 32.

In an n-slit experiment with slits labeled by $\mathcal{N} = \{\, 1, 2, \ldots, n \,\}$, detecting that the particle passed through any of the slits $\alpha \subset \mathcal{N}$ plays the role of the first measurement, described by a map ϕ_α. The measurement of the interference pattern on the screen is hence the second measurement. Each possible combination of open slits α may have its particular interference pattern as long as the integrated intensity is independent of whether the slits are opened individually or jointly, so that $\phi_\alpha(e) = \sum_{k\in\alpha} \phi_{\{\,k\,\}}(e)$. Clearly, the total intensity is bounded by unity, so that $\phi_{\mathcal{N}}(e) \in V_e^+$.

We discuss now briefly the assumption that ϕ_α is coherent for the effect $\phi_\alpha(e)$ and hence is a CLR. Assume that the probability for an effect g depends only on the integrated intensity that arrives through the slits α, i.e., $\phi_\alpha(e) \equiv \sum_{k\in\alpha} \phi_{\{\,k\,\}}(e) \geq g$. In this case, the coherence assumption $\phi_\alpha(g) = g$ assures that putting the simultaneously opened slits α in front of a measurement with outcome g does not change that outcome.

We recursively define (in general non-positive) maps η_α via

$$\phi_\alpha = \sum_{\beta\subset\alpha} \eta_\beta. \tag{15}$$

Then those maps η_α are exactly the interference terms $I_{|\alpha|}(\alpha)$ as defined by Sorkin[29], adapted to the language chosen here. In Eq. (15) we try to write the map on the l.h.s. in terms of the lower order correlations. The difference between the actual map ϕ_α and this lower order sum is then defined as η_α.

In a quantum mechanical n-slit experiment the slits are described by projections Π_k obeying $\sum \Pi_k \leq \mathbb{1}$. We let $\Pi_\alpha = \sum_{k\in\alpha} \Pi_k$ and therefore

$$\phi_\alpha \colon X \mapsto \Pi_\alpha X \Pi_\alpha \equiv \sum_{\beta\subset\alpha \colon |\beta|\leq 2} \eta_\beta(X), \tag{16}$$

that is, $\eta_\beta = 0$ whenever $|\beta| > 2$. That is, in quantum mechanics all interference terms above the second order vanish. We mention that in general this absence only occurs if the quantum instrument follows Lüders's rule, as a counterexample may serve $\phi_\alpha \colon X \mapsto \sqrt{A_\alpha} X \sqrt{A_\alpha}$ with $A_\alpha = \sum_k A_k$ and $A_1 = \mathbb{1}/2$, $A_2 = |0\rangle\langle 0|/2$, $A_3 = |1\rangle\langle 1|/2$. Such measurements, however, may fail to have a proper physical interpretation as a triple-slit experiment, since the operators A_k may act non-locally.

For generalized probabilistic models, though, we can easily have higher order correlations: Consider the AOU space with $V^+ = \operatorname{cone}\{a_1, \ldots, a_5\}$, where $a_1, \ldots, a_4$ is a basis of V, $a_5 = a_1 + a_2 + a_3 - a_4$, and $e = a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \equiv a_4 + a_5$. We choose $\phi_\alpha(e) = \sum_{k\in\alpha} a_k$ for $\alpha \subset \{1, 2, 3\} \equiv \mathcal{N}$. A brief calculation yields for $\alpha \subsetneq \mathcal{N}$,

$$\phi_\alpha = \sum_{k\in\alpha} a_k \omega_k^\alpha \tag{17}$$

where ω_k^α are arbitrary choices of states with $\omega_k^\alpha(a_k) = 1$. Since those states are not unique, we can e.g. use this freedom to achieve commutativity, $\phi_\alpha \circ \phi_\beta = \phi_\beta \circ \phi_\alpha$, or to get vanishing double-slit correlations, $\eta_{\{k,\ell\}} = 0$. In contrast, the map for the triple-slit is the identity mapping, $\phi_\mathcal{N} = e^\sharp \equiv \mathrm{id}$. From Eq. (17) we see that $a_4 \notin \eta_\alpha(V)$ except for $\alpha = \mathcal{N}$, i.e., nonvanishing triple-slit correlations occur.

IV. DISCUSSION

An important property of quantum systems is that the measurement necessarily changes the state of the system—or in a Heisenberg type-of-picture that the description of a measurement depends on previous measurements that have been performed. How this change occurs in general depends on the actual implementation of the measurement. In quantum mechanics, however, the change induced by projective measurements according to Lüders is the least disturbing and least biased implementation of a projective measurement. We re-derived this rule in quantum mechanics (cf. Sec. III A) solely from the coherence assumption stated in Definition 3. This definition of coherent Lüders rules (CLRs) can be applied to a wide class of hypothetical non-quantum models, namely the generalized probabilistic models which can described by means of Archimedean ordered vector spaces.

We showed in Proposition 5 that CLRs are exactly those maps which do not disturb any subsequent and possibly more "noisy" implementation of the same measurement. We also showed that familiar results of repeatability and compatibility hold (Proposition 6, cf. also Refs. 9 and 11).

In quantum mechanics, Lüders's rule is directly linked to and singles out the projection operators, which in turn play a key role e.g. in spectral theory. (Celebrated results for a generalized spectral theory[10,33,34] are, however, linked to neutral maps.) We find that for extremal measurement effects (a generalization of rank-one projections in quantum mechanics) an CLR always exists, while necessary conditions for existence have been given in Proposition 7. Also, in certain pathological cases, the CLR is not unique. This ambiguity might be

unsatisfactory, but for quantum mechanics and classical mechanics the conditions of being a CLR are sufficient to achieve uniqueness, so that adding any further condition is of a rather speculative kind.

Finally we demonstrated in Sec. III B that CLRs occurred already earlier in Spekkens's toy model[1] and that this toy model can now be seen as an instance of a much wider class of models with a natural notion of sequential measurements. For those models it is e.g. straightforward to compute the upper limit for the Leggett-Garg inequality in Eq. (12). As a last instance we discussed in Sec III C the triple-slit experiment, finding that generalized probabilistic models with a CLR can easily have substantial triple-slit correlations, while it is an important prediction of quantum mechanics that those are absent.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The proof of Lemma 4 was simplified by one of the anonymous referees. For discussions, hints, and amendments I am particularly indebted to J. Emerson, O. Gühne, R. Hübener, J.-Å. Larsson, V.B. Scholz, M. Ziman, and Z. Zimborás. I thank the Centro de Ciencias de Benasque, where part of this work has been done, for its hospitality during the workshop on quantum information 2013. I acknowledge support from the BMBF (Chist-Era Project QUASAR), the Brazilian agency CAPES, through the program Science without Borders, the DFG, the EU (Marie Curie CIG 293993/ENFOQI), and the FQXi Fund (Silicon Valley Community Foundation).

Appendix A: Elements with a coherent Lüders's rule in dichotomic norm cones

In a dichotomic norm cone (cf. Sec. I C), the set of effects admitting a CLR is given by $\{0, e\} \cup \partial^+ V^+$, as stated in Sec. III B. For $f = (t, \mathbf{f}) \in V_e^+$ we have $\|f\| = 1$ if and only if $t = 1 - \|\mathbf{f}\|$ and $\|\mathbf{f}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Assume now that f admits a CLR, but $0 \neq f \neq e$. By virtue of Proposition 7 (ii) it follows that $\|f\| = 1$ and $\|\mathbf{f}\| = \frac{1}{2}$. The first statement is obtained by choosing $g = f$ and the second statement by the choice $0 \leq g = (1 - 2\|\mathbf{f}\|)e = f - (\|\mathbf{f}\|, \mathbf{f}) \leq f$. If now $a \in \partial^+ V^+$ and $p > 0$, such that $pa \leq f$, then also $a \leq f$. This reads $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \geq \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{a}\|$ and therefore $f = a$.

Appendix B: Obtaining Eq. (12)

Under the result $A \sharp B = (2\beta - 1)A + 2(\mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{b})e$ [Eq. (10)] we bound the correlation term $\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle_\omega = \omega(A \sharp B + B - A)$ [Eq. (11)] for dichotomic norm cones, assuming $A = a - a_\neg = (0, 2\mathbf{a})$, and $B = b - b_\neg = (2\beta - 1, 2\mathbf{b})$. Writing $\omega = (1, \mathbf{w})$, this yields for $\mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{2}\langle \mathrm{LG}' \rangle_\omega &= \mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{w} \cdot (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}) + (2\beta - 1)(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{a} + \tfrac{1}{2}) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{b}\|[\mathbf{a}' \cdot \underline{\mathbf{b}} + \|\underline{\mathbf{b}} - 2\mathbf{a}\| - 1] + \tfrac{1}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

with $\underline{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{b}/\|\mathbf{b}\|$. The inequality is due to $\beta \leq 1 - \|\mathbf{b}\|$, $\|\mathbf{w}\|_* \leq 1$, and $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{a} \geq -\frac{1}{2}$. The bound is sharp, if $\beta = 1 - \|\mathbf{b}\|$ and $\mathbf{w} \cdot (\underline{\mathbf{b}} - 2\mathbf{a}) = \|\underline{\mathbf{b}} - 2\mathbf{a}\|$. Using the conditions from Eq. (9), we have $\|\underline{\mathbf{b}} - 2\mathbf{a}\| \geq -\mathbf{a}' \cdot (\underline{\mathbf{b}} - 2\mathbf{a}) = 1 - \mathbf{a}' \cdot \underline{\mathbf{b}}$ and hence the term in square brackets is never negative. This makes the choice $\|\mathbf{b}\| = \frac{1}{2}$ optimal and we arrive at the sharp bound of Eq. (12).

[1]R. W. Spekkens, "Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory," Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032110 (2007).

[2]A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995).

[3]W. M. Itano, D. J. Heinzen, J. J. Bollinger, and D. J. Wineland, "Quantum Zeno effect," Phys. Rev. A **41**, 2295–2300 (1990).

[4]G. Kirchmair, F. Zähringer, R. Gerritsma, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, A. Cabello, R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, "State-independent experimental test of quantum contextuality," Nature (London) **460**, 494–497 (2009).

[5]G. Lüders, "Über die Zustandsänderung durch den Meßprozeß," Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **443**, 323–328 (1951).

[6]G. Lüders, "Concerning the state-change due to the measurement process," Ann. d. Phys. **15**, 663–670 (2006).

[7]M. Ozawa, "Quantum measuring processes of continuous observables," J. Math. Phys. **25**, 79–87 (1984).

[8]T. Heinosaari and M. Ziman, *The mathematical language of quantum theory: from uncertainty to entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2012).

[9]B. Mielnik, "Theory of filters," Comm. Math. Phys. **15**, 1–46 (1969).

[10]H. Araki, "On a characterization of the state space of quantum mechanics," Comm. Math. Phys. **75**, 1–24 (1980).

[11]G. Niestegge, "A representation of quantum measurement in order-unit spaces," Found. Phys. **38**, 783–795 (2008).

[12]C. Ududec, H. Barnum, and J. Emerson, "Three slit experiments and the structure of quantum theory," Found. Phys. **41**, 396–405 (2011).

[13]S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, "Quantum nonlocality as an axiom," Found. Phys. **24**, 379–385 (1994).

[14]P. Janotta, "Generalizations of boxworld," EPTCS **95**, 183–192 (2012).

[15]V. I. Paulsen and M. Tomforde, "Vector spaces with an order unit," Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58**, 1319–1359 (2009).

[16]E. M. Alfsen, *Compact convex sets and boundary integrals*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete No. 57 (Springer, Berlin, 1971).

[17]V. I. Paulsen, *Completely bounded maps and operator algebras*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics No. 78 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002).

[18]G. Ludwig, *An Axiomatic Basis for Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. I-II (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987).

[19]P. Mittelstaedt, *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics and the Measurement Process* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).

[20]H. Barnum and A. Wilce, "Information processing in convex operational theories," Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci. **270**, 3–15 (2011).

[21]E. M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz, *State spaces of operator algebras: basic theory, orientations and $C*$-products* (Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001).

[22]J. Barrett, "Information processing in generalized probabilistic theories," Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032304 (2007).

[23]M. Pawłowski and A. Winter, ""Hyperbits": The information quasiparticles," Phys. Rev. A **85**, 022331 (2012).

[24]M. Kleinmann, T. J. Osborne, V. B. Scholz, and A. H. Werner, "Typical local measurements in generalized probabilistic theories: Emergence of quantum bipartite correlations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 040403 (2013).

[25]T. Fritz, "On the existence of quantum representations for two dichotomic measurements," J. Math. Phys. **51**, 052103 (2010).

[26]A. J. Leggett and A. Garg, "Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks?" Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 857–860 (1985).

[27]C. Budroni, T. Moroder, M. Kleinmann, and O. Gühne, "Bounding temporal quantum correlations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 020403 (2013).

[28]C. Budroni and C. Emary, "Temporal quantum correlations and leggett-garg inequalities in multilevel systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 050401 (2014).

[29]R. D. Sorkin, "Quantum mechanics as quantum measure theory," Mod. Phys. Lett. A **9**, 3119–3127 (1994).

[30]U. Sinha, C. Couteau, T. Jennewein, R. Laflamme, and G. Weihs, "Ruling out multi-order interference in quantum mechanics," Science **329**, 418–421 (2010).

[31]G. Niestegge, "Conditional probability, three-slit experiments, and the Jordan algebra structure of quantum mechanics," Adv. Math. Phys. **2012**, 156573 (2012).

[32]B. Dakić, T. Paterek, and Č. Brukner, "Density cubes and higher-order interference theories," New J. Phys. **16**, 023028 (2014).

[33]E. M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz, "Non-commutative spectral theroy for affine function spaces on convex sets," Memoirs AMS **6**, 1–120 (1976).

[34]E. M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz, *Geometry of state spaces of operator algebras* (Birkhäuser, Boston, 2003).